

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested. After entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1-12 and 16-18 remain pending in the present application. No new matter has been added.<sup>1</sup>

By way of summary, the Office Action presented the following issues: the Office objected to Claim 16 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.126 as not preserving the original numbering of the claims; and Claims 1-12 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Hirohata (Japanese Patent Application Publ'n No. 2002-135671) in view of Ferris (U.S. Patent Application Publ'n No. 2003/0104832 A1).

### CLAIM OBJECTION

The Office objected to Claim 16 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.126 as not preserving the original numbering of the claims. Despite Applicants' arguments in the Request for Reconsideration filed December 2, 2009, directed to that objection,<sup>2</sup> and Applicants' express invitation to respond thereto in an Advisory Action,<sup>3</sup> the Advisory Action issued December 31, 2009, failed to address Applicants' arguments.

For the same reasons discussed in the Request for Reconsideration, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the objection to Claim 16. Failing that, Applicants request that the Office comply with MPEP § 707.07 (f), which requires the Examiner to make proper reference to Applicants' arguments regarding the objection to Claim 16.

---

<sup>1</sup> The amendments to independent Claims 1, 7, 12, and 16 find support at least in Figure 10 and in its accompanying text in the specification.

<sup>2</sup> Amendment filed December 2, 2009, at 2.

<sup>3</sup> Id., at 4.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-12 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Hirohata in view of Ferris. In light of that rejection, independent Claims 1, 7, 12, and 16 have been amended to clarify the claimed inventions and to thereby more clearly patentably define over the applied references.

Amended Claim 1 recites a method including, in part, “providing information . . . depending on whether a URL is included in the state information . . . .” Applicants respectfully submit that Hirohata and Ferris fail to disclose or suggest that feature.

Hirohata concerns a server apparatus, in which “The URL information demanded from the client apparatus is specified (S603).”<sup>4</sup> In the Hirohata server apparatus, “Search results are made the last with a response message, and it transmits to a client apparatus (S604).”<sup>5</sup> According to Hirohata, “Search results and applicable URL information are included in a response message.”<sup>6</sup>

That is, Hirohata merely describes including applicable URL information in a response message. Hirohata does not contemplate the case in which the applicable URL information is not included. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Hirohata fails to disclose or suggest “providing information . . . depending on whether a URL is included in the state information,” as recited in amended Claim 1.

Ferris concerns a mobile telephone network. Further, Ferris does not disclose or suggest a URL, much less a provision of information depending on a URL. It is respectfully submitted that Ferris simply does not disclose or suggest “providing information . . . depending on whether a URL is included in the state information,” as recited in amended Claim 1.

---

<sup>4</sup> Hirohata, para. [0018].

<sup>5</sup> Id.

<sup>6</sup> Id.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Hirohata and Ferris, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest “providing information . . . depending on whether a URL is included in the state information,” as advantageously recited in amended Claim 1.

Thus, Applicants submit that Claim 1 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguishes over any proper combination of Hirohata and Ferris for at least the foregoing reasons.

Applicants additionally submit that independent Claims 7, 12, and 16 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguish over any proper combination of Hirohata and Ferris for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to Claim 1.

#### NEW CLAIMS

Applicants have added new Claims 17-18 to set forth the invention recited in Claim 1 in a varying scope. It is respectfully submitted that the new claims find support as least in Figure 10 and in its accompanying text in the specification. Thus, no new matter has been added. It is further submitted that new Claims 17-18 are allowable by virtue of their dependency and for the more detailed features presented by the new claims.

CONCLUSION

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is patentably distinguished over the cited art and is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.


Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Brian R. Epstein  
Registration No. 60,329